Appendix A CEQA Checklist

North Connector Project – CEQA Environmental Checklist

Project Description:

- 1. **Project Title:** North Connector Project (the project).
- 2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Solano Transportation Authority
- Contact Person and Phone Number: Janet Adams, Director of Projects. (707) 424-6075.
- 4. **Project Location:** The North Connector Project is located immediately north of the Interstate 80/Interstate 680/State Route 12 (I-80/I-680/SR12) Interchange area in the City of Fairfield and an unincorporated area of Solano County.
- 5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Same as lead agency above.
- 6. **General Plan Designation:** Land use designations within the study area are commercial and residential uses in the areas within the City of Fairfield, and agricultural and grazing in areas within Solano County.
- 7. **Zoning:** There are various zoning designations in the project area.
- 8. **Description of Project:** The North Connector Project begins at the junction of SR12 West and Red Top Road and then proceeds along the north side of State Route12 and I-80, connecting to the existing four-lane Business Center Drive. From this part east to its connection with Mangels Blvd, the project would utilize the existing four-lane Business Center Drive. (No modifications would be necessary) Where Business Center Drive connects with Mangels Boulevard, the Project would reconstruct this intersection to align the main flow of traffic along Business Center Drive to connect to Suisun Valley Road.

A portion of new roadway is planned to be constructed from the intersection of Mangels Boulevard and Suisun Valley Road to the east to Suisun Creek as part of a recently approved local development project (Fairfield Corporate Commons Project). The City of Fairfield recently certified the Fairfield Corporate Commons Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) under CEQA and approved this project (August 2005). The North Connector Project would extend this new roadway to the east, across Suisun Creek, and connect with Abernathy Road at the I-80/Abernathy Road interchange.

- 9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The proposed North Connector project is located in an unincorporated portion of Solano County and the City of Fairfield, north of I-80 in the Suisun Valley and Green Valley areas. The project area is located near the Solano Community College which is located to the north of Cordelia. The remainder of the surrounding area is commercial and residential developments in the City of Fairfield and agricultural uses within Solano County.
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): Permits, reviews, concurrence and approvals may be required for project construction from United States Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

	esthetics, page 4	X. Mineral Resources, page 17
II. A	gricultural Resources, page 5	XI. Noise, page 18
III. A	ir Quality, page 6	XII. Population & Housing, page 19
☑ IV. B	Biological Resources, page 7	XIII. Public Services, page 20
☑ V. C	ultural Resources, page 9	XIV. Recreation, page 21
⊠ VI. G	Geology & Soils, page 10	XV. Transportation & Circulation, page 22
⊠ VII. ⊦	Hazardous Materials, page 12	XVI. Utilities & Service Systems, page 23
⊠ VIII. 14	Hydrology & Water Quality, page	XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance, page 25
X IX. L	and Use & Planning, page 16	

Determination On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. \boxtimes I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in the attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigates pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. Daryl Halls Date **Executive Director**

Solano Transportation Authority

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

I. Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to: trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				\boxtimes
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				

- **c.** *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measures VIS 1a and VIS 1b would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- d. *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measure VIS 2 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

II. Agricultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use?		\boxtimes		
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or with a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				

a. through c. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of mitigation measure LU 3 and LU4 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

North Connector Project Appendix A-CEQA checklist November 2006

a. III. Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
 a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan or Congestion Management Plan? 				
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
 e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? 				

b. and d. *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measure AIR1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

IV. Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse impact on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to: marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with an established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, Regional, or state habitat Conservation plan?				

- **a.** *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measures BIO 2 through BIO 8 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- **b.** Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO 2 through BIO 8 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- **c.** *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measure BIO 9 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- **d.** *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measures BIO 2 through BIO 8 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- **e.** *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measure BIO 1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level

V. Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?					
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource, pursuant to Section 15064.5?		\boxtimes			
 c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic features? 					
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					

- **a.** *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measure CUL 1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- **b.** Potentially Significant Impact unless Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of mitigation measure CUL-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

VI. Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		\boxtimes		
iv) Landslide?				
b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		\boxtimes		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in table 18-1b of the Uniform Building Code (1994),			\boxtimes	

creating substantial risks to life	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or property? e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				\boxtimes

a.ii, **a.iii**, and aiv. *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated*. Implementation of mitigation measures GEO 1 through GEO 5 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

- **b.** *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measures GEO 6a through GEO 6d would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.
- **c.** *Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* See VI.a above.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				\boxtimes
h) Expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

d. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of mitigation measures HAZ 1 through HAZ 7 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		\boxtimes		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or area including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			\boxtimes	
g) Place housing within a 100- year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				\boxtimes
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
 i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? 				\boxtimes
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes

a. **Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** Implementation of mitigation measures WQ 1 through WQ 3 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

IX. Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?			\boxtimes	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
 c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? 				

b. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of mitigation measure LU 2 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level

X. Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?					
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?					

XI. Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:		<u>-</u>	<u> </u>	•
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of the other agencies?				
 b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? 				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				\boxtimes
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes
d. Potentially Significant Unles measure NOISE 1 would redu				
XII. Population and Housing	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:	•			•
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly, (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				

c. Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of mitigation measure COM 1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

XIII. Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
Would the project:					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
i) Fire protection?		\boxtimes			
ii) Police protection?		\boxtimes			
iii) Schools?					
iv) Parks?				\boxtimes	
v) Other public facilities?				\boxtimes	

a.i, and aii. *Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.* Implementation of mitigation measure SERV 3 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

XIV. Recreation

		Potentially Significant		
	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				\boxtimes
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				

XV. Transportation and Traffic

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\boxtimes
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				\boxtimes
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				\boxtimes
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				\boxtimes
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				\boxtimes

VII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have the potential to degrade quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				